

ILLINOIS HISTORIC SITES ADVISORY COUNCIL

Illinois Historic Preservation Agency  
Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library  
112 N. 6<sup>th</sup> St.  
Multipurpose Room

October 30, 2015

Presiding: Ted Karamanski, Chair

Council Members Present:

Ted Karamanski	Katherine Hamilton Smith
Nora Pat Small	Douglas Kullen
Carla Bruni	Raymond Terry Tatum
Paul Kapp	Victoria Granacki
Janine Wilkosz	Norm Moline

Non-Voting Council Members Present:

Staff Members Present:

Andrew Heckenkamp	Anna Margaret Barris
Amy Hathaway	David Halpin
Darius Bryka	Carol Dyson
Joe Phillippe	

Guests:

Richard Darnell	Rachel Ensor
Valerie Olafson	Ted Hild
Erica Ruggiero	David Johnson
Mark Wagner	John Cramer
Blaine Ensor	Nancy Darnell
Charleen Surtle	Frances Berg
Roald Berg	Anna Pierce
John Power	David Hagney
Hal Hassen	Dawn Cobb

**CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting was called to order at 10:33 AM.

**READING OF THE MINUTES**

Minutes were approved as read. Roll was taken. Brown, Hanser, Kraemer, and Bullock were absent.

**CHAIR REPORT**

Chair Karamanski welcomed everyone to the Council meeting and went over the procedures for the day.

## STAFF REPORT

Heckenkamp gave the staff report. He named IHPA's new trustee members and chair. The IHPA Board of Trustees will meet on Monday and the board is expected to appoint an interim director for the agency. Mackevich, the director of the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library, had resigned and Nadine O'Leary has been serving as the Interim Director. Heckenkamp thanked the outgoing members on IHSAC and explained that the new members will be approved at the Trustee meeting.

## NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

### LISTINGS

**Thompson Brothers Rock Art Site (Union County).** Mark Wagner gave the presentation. The Thompson Brothers Rock Art site is locally significant and eligible under Criterion A for its association with the Civil War within Illinois. The site is also eligible under Criterion D for yielding information regarding the Civil War. The period of significance is 1861 – 1865.

Kullen asked where the engravings were. Wagner explained that it was a street in Giant City State Park. Streets are long avenues where rocks separated. The Knights of the Golden Circle met in this location. The names engraved were deliberately put there. Kullen asked how prominent the inscriptions were for they seemed hidden, and what evidence proved they met there.

Wagner stated that Rendleman [lodge member of the Knights of the Golden Circle] said they met in Giant City State Park. These inscriptions went up 8 days after the meeting.

Some discussion ensued about formatting and grammar.

Granacki found the nomination interesting but asked whether the inscriptions were prominent since the names are a small part of the overall story. Wagner explained that there is nothing else left from the Civil War indicating the struggle in southern Illinois. Karamanski added that sketchier art was approved in the past.

Smith questioned the use of the term Rock Art in describing the inscriptions. Wagner explained that Rock Art is a general catchall for Historic and Prehistoric engravings. It could be called epigraphic inscription.

Kapp said that the nomination seemed to be of the site and wanted to see the actual boundaries if not just inscriptions. Granacki asked whether the nomination included the whole side of the rock. Wagner pointed out that the boundaries are on the map in the nomination. Kapp wanted a more definite boundary of the site.

Karamanski questioned where the site was within the park. Kullen asked whether the park was protected since it is state property. Wagner replied that there are rock art sites on state and federal property that are vandalized. Karamanski added that protection isn't the main goal. It is to bring attention to the public. Karamanski said that the nomination needed a verbal boundary.

More discussion ensued on the use of the term Rock Art. Hathaway explained that staff had this discussion with Wagner about Rock Art. Staff defers to Wagner as he is the expert in Rock Art in Illinois.

Staff opinion (Joe Phillippe, Staff Archaeologist) was positive. Motion to recommend was made by Smith and seconded by Moline. Motion carried.

**Jackson County Courthouse (Murphysboro).** Rachel Ensor gave the presentation. The property is locally significant and eligible under Criterion A for Politics/Government as the seat of Government for Jackson County and under Criterion C as an example of Classical Revival architecture. Staff opinion (Heckenkamp) positive.

Wilcosz asked about the period of significance since there had been an older courthouse on the site. Hathaway explained that we used the date of the current building since the former was demolished.

Granacki stated that it was a handsome building worthy of nomination. Granacki had questions about the terminology and architectural classification used in the nomination. Ensor explained that the marketing and historical descriptions never called it Classical Revival but the original plans had more embellishments. The building was described as Beaux Arts in the records.

Small seconded the encouragement to take out Beaux Arts except the initial one. Small added that using the term “square” makes it confusing as to whether the surrounding buildings are included. Hathaway noted that staff can clarify the boundary in the nomination. Heckenkamp added that, for consistency, staff includes a contributing site when nominating courthouses. Moline concurred with the idea of the courthouse square as a historic feature.

Discussion ensued as to whether the argument for Criterion A was sufficient. Kapp believed the argument for Criterion C was enough to nominate the courthouse. Bruni said that the courthouse is a type and as such is accepted as an important part of the area. She believed Criterion A was acceptable. Granacki thought that Criterion A could be strengthened. Smith and Bruni commented on the courthouse’s high level of integrity.

Staff opinion (Heckenkamp) was positive. Motion to recommend was made by Granacki and seconded by Tatum. Motion carried.

**George E. Van Hagen House, Barrington.** Andrew Heckenkamp gave the presentation. The property is locally significant and eligible under Criterion C as an example of Arts and Crafts and Federal Revival architecture. The period of significance is ca. 1912.

Kapp questioned why the architect John Nyden was not listed in area of significance. Kapp found nomination to be verbose and was more interested Nyden’s work. Heckenkamp explained that the house was not being nominated as a master architect. The nomination is for its architectural style. Kapp believed he was a regional architect of some competence. Heckenkamp explained that it is difficult to make arguments for master architect. Hathaway provided the criteria necessary for nominating properties as a work of a master architect.

Kapp did not see the combination of Federal and Arts & Crafts as exceptional. Hathaway explained that within the context of the community it was comparable. Kapp: wanted more information about the architect. Karamanski believed it was sufficient. Tatum said that in terms of Chicago architects there may not be much more information about him. Tatum added that unless it was necessary to building the case for listing, he

understood why the author did the nomination that way. Hathaway stated that for nominating the property for its architectural style, the context is the style.

Tatum believed that the nomination needed more context about country houses. Granacki said that it was built as a gentleman's farm and originally had 18 buildings. She asked whether it was appropriate to list it this as a country estate if it was originally a gentleman's farm. Smith stated that there were examples of both country farms and complexes of distinctive houses with a few buildings associated with it. Lake County was full of both examples of transitions with farm part gone and house remaining. Granacki questioned whether this posed an integrity problem. Heckenkamp explained that this was why we did not nominate it as a gentleman's farm.

Hathaway provided an example of a recent nomination of an estate that only included the Art Deco house. This was not uncommon with past practice. Smith agreed that that property was similar and so intact.

Staff opinion (Heckenkamp) was positive. Motion to recommend was made by Smith and seconded by Small. Motion carried.

**John Dupont House (New Burnside)**, Richard Darnell gave the presentation. The property is locally significant and eligible under Criterion B for Politics/Government for its association with local politician John Dupont and under Criterion C as an example of Italianate architecture. The period of significance is 1872-1891.

Tatum asked whether the Johnson County Courthouse still there. Darnell explained it was still a functioning courthouse. Tatum stated that, under Criterion B, a person can be recognized for building most closely associated with their life and questioned whether the courthouse would have a closer connection with DuPont's importance than his house. Heckenkamp said DuPont's home is most closely associated with his significance; courthouses are not usually nominated under Criterion B since many people are associated with them. Tatum wanted to make sure the National Park Service would not return the nomination.

Granacki asked Darnell whether he had a personal relationship with the house. Darnell explained that it was his wife's family home.

Kullen wanted to know whether Mr. DuPont rose to the level of significance needed for Criterion B. Karamanski: very prominent locally due to the many businesses he established in the area.

Staff opinion (Heckenkamp) positive.  
Motion to recommend was made by and seconded by. Motion carried.

Break for Lunch: 12:07 PM. Meeting reconvened at 12:37 PM.

**Turner School (Rockford)**. Valerie Olafson gave the presentation. The property is locally significant and eligible under Criterion C as an example of Classical and Colonial Revival architecture with Richardsonian Romanesque influences. The period of significance is 1898.

Moline mentioned he went to 6<sup>th</sup> grade there. Granacki wondered if the stairs had been altered. Olafson explained that the stairs were not moved but were altered to make code. Karamanski questioned the use of Colonial Revival. Hathaway explained that the cupola

on top and some other features appeared to have Colonial Revival influence but that can be removed from the nomination. The era had a mixing of certain styles and staff recommended to include all those that were referenced. This blend of styles was typical of a schools built during that time. Discussion ensued. Small recommended using Romanesque Revival with Classical Revival details.

Bruni asked why the parking lot was included in 1/2 of the boundary. Olafson said that The legal boundaries of the property included the area of the parking lot. Heckenkamp explained that the lot is historically associated with the school. Moline added that the parking lot was part of the playground area when he attended.

Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Motion to recommend was made by Granacki and seconded by Bruni. Motion carried.

Small excused herself.

**Hauge Lutheran Church (Norway).** David Johnson gave the presentation. The property is nationally significant and eligible under Criterion A for Ethnic Heritage for its association with Norwegian settlement and Norwegian Heritage in the United States. The period of significance is 1847 – 1965. The property meets Criteria Consideration A for religious properties for it derives its primary significance from ethnic heritage.

Granacki asked whether this was the most important Norwegian settlement in the country. Johnson replied that the church itself is simple but the historical significance is very important.

Bruni commented that the carpentry and artistry were impressive and asked if it was still intact. Johnson confirmed that it was but it was hard to show it on pictures. Hathaway added that it was difficult to see the interiors due to the display cases, but it's all pretty much intact. Bruni asked whether it also could be listed for architecture. Hathaway replied that it could as a country church, but staff opted to nominate the church for history due to its association with the first settlement of Norwegians in the United States. Hathaway went on to explain the time and work involved in getting the nomination to this point, which included a physical analysis of the structure conducted by former council member Christopher Stratton. Johnson added that there was not a lot of written records for 1846. Granack believed it was a strong case for history. Johnson said three busloads of tourists from Norway came to the church this year alone.

Moline questioned the use of a 1950 source to support the definitive statement of the church being the first U.S. settlement. Hathaway said she had contacted the King Olaf scholar in Minnesota to find out the best sources of information. The definitive work was the book from Carleton. Moline suggested that some qualifications be added to the footnote for clarification. Moline also had questions on there being only two listings in the National Register for Norwegian Heritage as nationally significant and asked about Decorah, Iowa. Hathaway explained that there are a lot of National Register listings but only two for national significance. Karamanski added that national significance is hard to prove. Johnson explained that though Norwegians spread across the Midwest, they first had permanent settlements in Norway, Illinois. Once farmland opened up in Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota many left via train and steamboat to settle in those states. Hathaway confirmed that other historians do not consider New York to be a permanent settlement. Norway was the first permanent settlement. Hathaway said that of the five sites selected in Illinois in the national study of ethnic studies in the country [in the 1970s effort to list ethnic settlements as National Historic Landmarks], Norway was the

only one outside of Chicago. Hathaway was surprised that nothing had been listed from Norway before.

Smith asked to clarify the paragraph on Norwegians locating across the country. Maybe make it clearer that there were many other settlements. Hathaway stated that staff can clarify that in the nomination.

Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Motion to recommend was made by Granacki and seconded by Bruni. Motion carried.

**Davis Theater (Chicago).** John Cramer gave the presentation. The property is locally significant and eligible under Criterion A for Entertainment/Recreation for its use as a theater in the Lincoln Square Community Area. The period of significance is 1918, the year it was constructed, to 1965, the fifty-year cutoff for significance. Tatum recused himself from this and the following nomination.

Kapp asked who Davis was. Cramer replied that he was not sure, but there is a Davis Street in the area.

Kullen was impressed by the research in the nomination, with links to Chicago, theaters, and nationwide. Smith agreed that it provided just the right amount of background of local and national history/context.

Granack asked whether Cramer was considering the 1930s changes significant. Cramer responded that nothing original [from 1918] was left in the lobby. The lobby will remain 1930s. The theater will go back to 1918 in the proposed rehabilitation project, except that only the partitions of the subdivided theater rooms on the north end will be removed to open the space back up. The features of the original space will be uncovered.

Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Motion to recommend was made by Granacki and seconded by Bruni. Motion carried.

**Central Manufacturing District: Original East Historic District (Chicago).** Erica Ruggiero gave the presentation. The property is locally significant and eligible under Criterion A for Industry as the first industrial park and under Criterion C for its good representation of architectural styles. The period of significance is 1902 - 1965.

Granacki believed the district was a good candidate and Ruggiero made a good case, but wanted to see more added to the architectural section, such as the number of buildings in a particular style and a discussion of the individual buildings and the characteristics they possess of a specific style. Smith agreed.

Wilcosz asked whether the district should be listed as having national significance. Hathaway said that Ruggiero completed the nomination alone and that it was a huge project. She went on to say that staff felt strongly that it was nationally significant but did not know how much more information would be needed to make the case. Many sources confirm that this was the first manufacturing district in the United States and that this type of complex was the next step from Pullman Company towns.

Kapp asked what the motivation was to nominate the district. Ruggiero explained that she worked as an intern at Landmarks Illinois on the 10 most endangered properties of 2014. The Central Manufacturing District was part of the list and none of the buildings

in the Original East Historic District were orange-rated under the Chicago Historic Resources Survey. [That would have afforded them some protection.] It was Ruggiero's hope that, once listed, the property owners would take advantage of the tax credits available. Hathaway said that Ruggiero and staff worked with Landmarks Illinois, which held the public meeting and helped the nomination go through the local process. Ruggiero added that there was no opposition by the owners and the meeting was hosted in a building in the district. The South Loop Business Association was there and was supportive. There was much interest in the district. Hathaway explained that Landmarks Illinois reached out to the alderman in the district. Frank Butterfield from Landmarks' regional office could not attend the meeting but wanted to go on record showing Landmarks' support for the nomination.

Smith brought up the case for National Significance and stated that in order to make the case, the nomination would have to show that the district was not only the 1<sup>st</sup> industrial park but also show evidence that it was influential in spurring others like it. Wilcosz: added that it should show it was a model. Hathaway said that staff was willing to work to include a wider context if the council recommended it and take it to the Park Service, and if they don't think it makes the case, we can stick with the original nomination.

Granacki suggested to leave it local and expand the architectural section. Bruni worried that a delay in getting it ready for a national significance argument could discourage interest in development and use of the tax credits now. Kapp asked whether the nationally significant designation would help in marketing the area for redevelopment. Ruggiero stated that she was currently working on nominating other districts affiliated with the Central Manufacturing District and would leave it up to the council whether it wanted her to proceed with national significance. Hathaway offered the option of leaving the nomination as is and providing additional documentation later. Hathaway was of the opinion that the district is nationally significant and that a case could be made to support it, but did not know how much time that would take and delay it would create. Bruni asked whether council could push it through and once it was listed, come back to it. Hathaway said that if there is no boundary change, staff could do the changes without having to bring the nomination back before the council.

More discussion ensued regarding the nomination and what needed to be addressed if it were to be listed for its national significance. Karamanski made the motion to move on nomination as it is and address revisions later.

Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Motion to recommend was made by Kapp and seconded by Wilcosz. Motion carried.

The next meeting is February 26 in Springfield.

Meeting adjourned at 2: 20 pm